

Serial No. 10/729,288

1 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2 In Re:

Date: September 7, 2004
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

3 Application of: Illeana Capote and Juvenal Rivero

SEP 07 2004

4 Serial No: 10/729,288

Art Unit: 3612

5 Filed: 12/8/2003

Examiner: Stephen Gordon

6 Atty. Dkt. No. 23078

7 Title: PROTECTOR FOR AUTOMOBILES

9 **AMENDMENT**11 **CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

13 I HEREBY CERTIFY that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent &
14 Trademark Office on September 7, 2004. I have been warned that willful false
15 statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C.
16 1001), and may jeopardize the validity of this application, document, registration or
17 patent resulting therefrom.

18 Vicky Prendes, Patent Department

19 (Typed or printed name of the person signing the certificate)



20 (Signature of the person signing the certificate)

21 FROM: SANCHELIMA & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
22 235 SW Le Jeune Road, Miami, Florida 33134
23 Ph:(305)447-1617 Fax:(305)445-848424 TO: Patent and Trademark Office25 Attn. Examiner: Stephen Gordon / Art Unit: 3612
26 Fax No. 703-872-9306

27 Papers included: Amendment.

28 Hon. Commissioner of Patents
29 Mail Stop: NON-FEE AMENDMENT
30 P.O. Box 1450
31 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

32 Sir:

33 In response to the recent Office action, please amend the above
34 referenced application as follows.

Serial No. 10/729,288

1 INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

2

3 The Examiner has objected the abstract of the disclosure because it
4 contains the term "means". Applicant has amended the abstract of the
5 disclosure obviate the Examiner's objections.

6

7 The Examiner has objected the specifications because the trademarks
8 "Velcro" and "Ziploc" mentioned in page 6 should appear in all capital
9 letters. Applicant has amended the specifications (page 6) to obviate the
10 Examiner's objections.

11

12 The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112,
13 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out
14 and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the
15 invention. Also, the Examiner stated that claims 3 through 6 would be
16 allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112,
17 second paragraph. Applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggestion to
18 overcome the informalities of the claims by incorporating claim 2 into
19 claim 1 and claim 3 now depends on claim 1.

20

21 The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as
22 being anticipated by Chang. Alternatively, the Examiner has rejected
23 claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese '216.
24 Alternatively, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C.
25 102(a) as being anticipated by Japanese '227. Applicant's proposed
26 amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections.